DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 708 FL 024 188

AUTHOR Harklau, Linda A.; Schecter, Sandra R.
TITLE Sociocultural Dimensions of Voice in Non-Native Language Writing.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 14p.; In: Bouton, Lawrence F., Ed. Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph Series Volume 7, p141-52, 1996; see FL 024 180.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; Authors; Communication Apprehension; Comparative Analysis; Language Patterns; Language Research; Language Styles; Linguistic Theory; Native Speakers; *Pragmatics; Research Needs; Rhetoric; *Second Languages; *Sociocultural Patterns; *Writing (Composition); Writing Instruction; *Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS *Voice (Rhetoric)

ABSTRACT

Discussion of one form of pragmatic competence, projecting a sense of stylistic voice into texts, explores how writing in a non-native language affects the ability to express stylistic voice and enter into social dialogue with readers. Using the published reflections of authors writing professionally in a non-native language, the analysis shows how differing social and historical circumstances under which the authors write in a second language affect their attitude and approach to the endeavor. Several common themes in the authors' experiences with creating a persona in second-language texts are also identified. These include a sense of disconnection with the target language, the idea that how one is taught about writing in a language affects what one writes about and how, and the experiencing of less anxiety and more freedom when writing in a non-native language. A research agenda to explore further the pragmatics of voice in second-language texts is suggested, including exploration of affective factors at a variety of proficiency levels. Contains 23 references. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 708

SOCIOCULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF VOICE IN NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE WRITING

Linda A. Harklau
Sandra R. Schecter

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Laurence F Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 023 122

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOCIOCULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF VOICE IN NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE WRITING

Linda A. Harklau
Sandra R. Schecter

Projecting a sense of stylistic voice into texts is an aspect of pragmatic competence that is particularly difficult to master. For L2 writers, the complexity of this task is compounded by an uncertain command of linguistic resources. Moreover, even extremely proficient bilinguals grapple with reconciling multiple systems of stylistic expression and cultural world views.

In this paper, we explore how writing in a non-native language affects the ability to express stylistic voice and to enter into a social dialogue with readers. Utilizing the published reflections of authors writing professionally in a non-native language, we show how the differing social and historical circumstances under which they write in an L2 affect their attitude and approach towards the endeavor. We also identify several common themes that run throughout these authors' experiences with creating a persona in L2 texts. Based on this analysis, we suggest a research agenda to explore further the pragmatics of voice in L2 texts.

INTRODUCTION

In compiling an annotated bibliography and synthesis of the research on writing in a non-native language for the National Center for the Study of Writing (Schecter & Harklau, 1991), the authors identified several gaps in the literature, areas which we felt deserved further exploration. In particular, considering the role of affective factors in the writing process, we were intrigued to find that research had yet to identify the particular concerns of those attempting self-expression in a less familiar language. With few exceptions, most notably Silva (1992), much of the research in this area appears to be derivative of first language writing issues--for example, surveys of writing anxiety that are based on similar surveys of L1 writers--rather than dealing with issues that may be unique to non-native language writing. In calling for more research into issues of identity and affect confronting non-native language writers (Schecter & Harklau, 1992), we asked "How much can be revealed about ... personality or character in non-native language writing? To what extent and in what ways do writers experience a constriction of their sense of selfhood? Or perhaps one's 'self' takes on different nuances when writing in different languages? How is it that some non-native language writers report experiencing less anxiety about writing in a non-native language than do writers who are composing in their native language?" This paper is our first step towards addressing these questions.

Before immersing ourselves in the details of this agenda, however, we wish first to acknowledge the complexity of the set of issues we have put on the table. Indeed, as post-structuralists and others have convincingly argued (cf. Yancey, 1994), it is not as though those who write in their native language can be claimed to possess a single,

multi-purpose identity. Rather, our voices are situated; and we are advised to locate our textual identities at the intersection of characterological makeup and the cultural image refracted in a given context (Faigley, 1994; Foucault, 1977). Sparing individuals from a multiplicity of discrete identities, that is, from clinical schizophrenia, is the *intertextuality* of their life experiences, the fact that they encounter similar or overlapping narratives across a variety of contexts, and are able to relate them in meaningful, integrative ways (Bakhtin, 1981). Although we endorse this representation, we at the same time must insist that if projecting a persona in text involves an intricate process of constructing a dialogic relationship between writer and reader, the complexity of the process is compounded in the case of non-native-language writers. They are likely to command fewer linguistic resources than native-language speaking counterparts and, moreover, must grapple with reconciling multiple, culturally-imbued systems of stylistic expression (cf. Powers & Gong, 1994).

We will return to elaborate further on aspects of this complexity. First, though: What is *voice*, or more precisely, in what sense do we use the term? In a 1992 column, William Safire noted increasing use of the term *voice* in literary criticism and the media. He distinguished two major meanings. The first is the linguistic or grammatical sense, be it active, passive, or middle voice (cf. Fox & Hopper, 1994). The second meaning he described as "the distinctive mode of expression, the expected quirks and trademark tone, the characteristic attitude of writer toward reader and subject," noting that T. S. Eliot (1954) identified this as the writer's "stylistic voice." It is this "stylistic voice" through which authors project their own unique persona and identity in texts that interests us here. In the same vein, playwright Sam Shepard (cited in Safire, 1992) asserts that "voice is almost without words...It's something in the spaces, in between." Working in the genre of analytic text, where one expects to find concrete delineations of terms, we own up to a certain discomfort in relying on metaphor to convey this notion of authorial persona. At the same time, we would be remiss to gloss this 'something,' as Shepard would have it, in empirical terms that may render the notion of stylistic voice more technically precise and yet not capture its full richness or subtlety. In the end, our most persuasive argument for pursuing this topic, despite our difficulty in defining it, is that if voice is an aspect of pragmatic competence that native language writers find elusive, it is reasonable to hypothesize that it is all the more difficult for non-native language writers to master.

Since stylistic voice is especially important in literary work, we made a decision to initiate our exploration by examining those who write professionally in a non-native language. Here we underscore that our decision was to begin by identifying writers' orientations toward the sociocultural and historical contexts that give rise to their work rather than by looking at specific linguistic practices (such as lexicalization, or use of tense and aspect, to give examples) in their texts. We acknowledge the usefulness of the latter approach in refining the concept of *contact literature* and in addressing the authenticity of various vernacular styles (cf. Kachru, 1987).[1] Our primary interest in examining these literary texts, however, is to propose, or place on the agenda, a set of issues that may be associated with entering into a dialogic relationship with an audience who, by virtue of linguistic and cultural origin, are positioned in a different social place than that of the author and, more importantly, do not necessarily share the author's sense of the social and power relationships implicit in the dialogue between writer and reader (cf. Bakhtin, 1981; 1986).

EFFECTS OF SOCIOCULTURAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

We identified four discrete categories of non-native language writers, distinguished by differences in the sociocultural and historical contexts which make non-native language writing either possible or necessary. In the following discussion, we draw from the work of: Eva Hoffman, whose book Lost in Translation (1989) addresses **the immigrant experience**; Alice Kaplan (1993), who, while residing both in her native and her adopted countries, seeks **out bilingualism and a dual cultural identity**; Chinua Achebe (Achebe, 1975; Rowell, 1990) and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (Ngũgĩ, 1981; 1993), African writers who **write in a former colonial language**; and Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) and Juan Flores (Flores, 1985; Flores & Yudice, 1990), whose work addresses the perspective of **linguistic minorities in the U.S.**

Although the authors share a particular interest in examining the sociocultural and historical contexts in which they employ a non-native language, they evidence vastly different motives for and attitudes towards non-native language writing as a mode of self-expression. Eva Hoffman, to start with, writes as a contemporary immigrant to Canada from Poland. As a white middle-class European, she appears to take for granted that her final goal will be to integrate completely into the mainstream English-speaking culture. In her retrospective memoir, Hoffman (1989) argues that the process of learning how to express identity and voice in a new language necessarily entails a process of self-transformation and the recreation of self-identity in the new culture. This process begins upon immersion in the new culture in a painful phase she dubs "exile." In exile, one enters a sort of semilingual or alingual state, where neither L1 or L2 is truly incorporated into self, and where neither seems a truly appropriate vehicle to express individual personality and voice. She recalls the inadequacy of her first language during this phase:

> "Polish, in a short time, has atrophied, shriveled from sheer uselessness. Its words don't apply to my new experiences; they're not coeval with any of the objects, or faces, or the very air I breathe in the daytime" (p. 107).

At the same time, using English for personal expression is equally uncomfortable. She likens it to "a school exercise, or performing in front of yourself, a slightly perverse act of self-voyeurism" (p. 121). In Hoffman's view, the process of taking on a new language, identity, and voice is at first artifice. In a new language, one's voice becomes monotonous, deliberate, heavy, and humorless. Hoffman laments that she cannot be the "light footed dancer" (p. 119) that she was in her native language.

As she proceeds down the road towards linguistic assimilation, Hoffman comes to feel that her very sense of reality is threatened. She discusses how native speakers unknowingly hold a consensus about reality. Outnumbered and surrounded by them, Hoffman understands that she needs to come to terms with this different world view, but she fears how much of herself (and her own voice) she will have to give up in the process. Eventually, she reconciles the two cultural value systems. She likens this process to fragments of others' voices entering her, remaking her "fragment by fragment, like a patchwork quilt" (p. 220). At the same time, she notes that there remains an inassimilable part of her that exists outside of culture (and language), a part of her that realizes that other cultural world views exist and that one way is not necessarily the **only** way to think or to be.

In looking back on her experience, Hoffman notes that at the same time she was seeking to assimilate to American culture, and to "live within {the target} language" (p. 194), many of her American-born peers were seeking to break out of the constraints both of their native language and of their culture. Such a one is Alice Kaplan, whose memoir French Lessons (1993) relates her efforts to develop an alternate identity and voice in L2 French. Like Hoffman, Kaplan is a white, middle-class 'Euro-American' who can blend visually into mainstream French culture. Unlike Hoffman, however, Kaplan's adoption of a second language is not imposed by irreversible socio-historical processes associated with migration. Rather, she voluntarily embraces French language and culture while remaining rooted in her first language and culture.

Kaplan experienced her earliest efforts to create a persona in a non-native language as redemptive. Her father had recently died, and her mother, ill and grieving, sent her to a Swiss boarding school for a year. Thus, for Kaplan, self-expression in a second language became associated with escape from an unpleasantness associated with her native language, English. As she puts it, "It felt like my life had been given to me to start over. French had saved me" (p. 57). In her quest for an authentic French voice, Kaplan seems willing to endure a number of slights from native French speakers who criticize or dismiss her efforts to approximate the stylistics and voice of a native speaker. She describes, for example, how a French boyfriend wrote corrections all over a love letter she had sent him, and recalls how as he read it he had made "that little ticking sound French people make...a fussy, condescending sound, by way of saying, 'That's *not* how one says it'" (p. 86). Nevertheless, Kaplan regards it a "privilege" to "live in translation" (p. 140). Significantly, she never represents her quest for mastery of L2 French as in any way threatening to her American identity.

Kaplan's experience forms an interesting contrast to Hoffman, who feels at times as though her identity and voice have been coopted by the new language. Kaplan has a far less ambivalent attitude towards self-expression in her adopted language. Perhaps it is precisely because Kaplan will not reside permanently in the target culture that she can embrace French with such unequivocal ardor--her identity in L1 is never seriously threatened because she knows that she can return to her native language ways virtually at will. The challenge for her, then, is to approximate as closely as possible a French persona even though she will never be wholly integrated into the culture. For Hoffman, on the other hand, L2 English is the only available means of public expression of persona and voice, while L1 becomes limited to a private sphere. She understands, correctly, that her survival will depend on her ability to appreciate the distinction and make the needed transition.

Whatever the differences in their psychological orientations, both Hoffman and Kaplan enter into their relationship with a non-native written language as assimilable, regarding their struggles with self-expression in L2 as a personal odyssey, and not part of a broader social phenomenon. Attitudinally, this position has far-reaching effects on whether they believe that taking on a new voice and identity in L2 is a worthwhile goal. For other L2 writers--those using the majority language while they are part of a linguistic minority, or those using the language of a former colonial ruler--the non-native language cannot be taken on its own terms, for it is associated with unequal power relationships. The dominant-subordinate relationship of the L1 and L2 cultures has repercussions for how willing writers are to

acknowledge and uncritically approximate a prototypical L2 voice, and how strenuously they argue for accommodation of their L1 identity when writing in L2.

Chinua Achebe is a Nigerian writer, a L1 Igbo speaker who writes in English. In a 1989 interview (Rowell, 1990), Achebe asserted that while Third World writers employ former colonial languages, they are reshaping the L2 to fit their experiences as they do it. Despite its colonial legacy, Achebe notes the value of English as lingua franca in a country with almost 200 varieties. Since English is already present in his culture and occupies a privileged position as the language of administration and higher education, Achebe believes that the best way to deal with it is to "contain and control" (p. 95) it by relegating it to specific spheres where its uses can be monitored. In his words,

> "Our people don't allow anything as powerful as that to keep knocking around without a job to do, because it would cause trouble...anything which is new and powerful, which appears on the horizon, is brought in and domesticated" (p. 95).

Personally, he feels that his role as a writer is to incorporate the L2 into his culture and to use it to tell his story and express his point of view. Thus, for Achebe, the issue is not the development of a new voice and identity in a second language, but how best to express L1 cultural identity and voice through the medium of L2, and by so doing to transform the former colonizer's medium.

Is Achebe's goal realistic? A fellow African writer, Kenyan Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, believes not. In his book Decolonising the mind (1981), Ngũgĩ includes a statement renouncing English L2 as a medium for his future writing, and announcing his intention to express himself solely in his African L1. While he acknowledges that language can have a purely utilitarian, communicative function, he also regards it as "a carrier for the history and the culture" in which it originated. He believes that these two aspects of language "are inseparable; they form a dialectical unity" (1993, p. 30). For Ngũgĩ, then, it is not possible to develop a voice and identity in L2 writing that is true to one's L1 cultural view, because an "oppressor language inevitably carries racist and negative images of the conquered nation" (1993, p. 33). Furthermore, writing in an L2 that exists in a neo-colonial power relationship with the L1 inevitably perpetuates these patterns of domination, and creates a voice which is alienated from the native culture.

American language minority writers share post-colonial writers' concerns regarding self-expression in a language that represents a hegemonic relationship. Unlike post-colonial writers, however, language minority writers must live with a daily intermingling of dominant and minority cultures. This non-negotiable reality leads Latino writers such as Gloria Anzaldúa and Juan Flores to argue for the synthesis of L1 and L2 codes in stylistic voice. While the other writers discussed previously, regardless of their attitude towards the non-native language, assume a separability of language codes, both Mexican-American Anzaldúa and Puerto Rican Flores carefully consider questions of discreteness and synthesis when negotiating their identities as writers. Both call for an "interlingual, border voice" (Flores & Yudice, 1990, p. 60) that affirms and legitimizes the act of straddling two cultures through writing. Flores argues that for New York Puerto Rican, or "Nuyorican" writers,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

bilingualism can initially seem as a predicament, as a "confining and prejudicial dilemma with no visible resolution," (Flores, 1985, p. 9) potentially creating in the individual a

> "...schizophrenia, of that pathological duality born of contending cultural worlds and, perhaps more significantly, of the conflicting pressures towards both exclusion and forced incorporation" (Flores & Yudice, 1990, p. 60).

Likewise, Anzaldúa in discussing the discomfort of living simultaneously with two languages and cultures, comments

> "Living on borders and in margins, keeping intact one's shifting and multiple identity and integrity, is like trying to swim in a new element, an 'alien' element" (1987, preface).

However, as the writer develops, bilingual discourse "becomes an issue of social contention and beyond that, a sign of potential enrichment and advantage" (Flores, 1985, p. 9). Flores argues that Nuyoricans develop a voice which is neither Puerto Rican nor assimilated. He understands well that this interlingual voice is in an embattled and stigmatized position, deemed non-standard in both monolingual English- and Spanish-speaking cultures. However, both he and Anzaldúa reject attempts to cast their language as illegitimate. Anzaldúa (1987) asserts,

> "I will no longer be made to feel ashamed of existing. I will have my voice: Indian, Spanish, white" (p. 59).

Flores argues that efforts to delegitimize inter-lingual Latino language uses are emblematic of a larger cultural and political struggle between Latino and the dominant Anglo culture over the terms of Latino participation in American society. He suggests that the metamorphosis of a border language is threatening to the dominant culture, because it represents a demand for change and accommodation of Latino language and culture in the broader society.

One sees a debate emerging among these L2 writers, and indeed within them, as to whether one can successfully collapse, merge, or mingle meaning and identity in two languages. Clearly, the socio-historical context in which each writes has a powerful effect on their position in this debate. While assimilationist writers such as Kaplan and Hoffman seem to believe that the non-native writer's task is to approximate existing target language and culture values for stylistic voice, Achebe argues from a post-colonial context that the non-native language writer has the power--almost the obligation--to transform norms for writing in the target language so that they more closely reflect L1 values and mores. However, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, writing in the same context, advocates against language mixing in any form. To him, a language imposed by a colonizer remains the language of the oppressor, and no amount of stylistic adaptation can alter that fact. As we have seen, American Latino writers present the strongest and most radical case for language mixing. What they advocate goes well beyond the development of a stylistic voice in L2 that reflects L1 cultural and aesthetic norms, to a mixing of codes themselves, in effect creating a new language. While Anzaldúa acknowledges that code-mixing creates a stigmatized variety,

observing that, "this infant language, this bastard language, Chicano Spanish, is not approved by any society," she places this consequence on the agenda for political action, contending that "we Chicanos no longer feel that we need to beg entrance" (Anzaldúa, 1987, preface). For those of us who teach writing to non-native speakers, these debates are not unfamiliar. We constantly re-enact them, as we wrestle individually and collectively with questions of how to simultaneously legitimize students' rights to transform language and have their voice be heard, while at the same time provide them with the literacy tools deemed necessary for them to succeed in academic contexts and the workplace.

COMMON THEMES

While the particular social and historical circumstances under which they write and create an identity in a non-native language capture the large share of these authors' attentions, there are also a number of themes that recur across the different pieces and contexts. For example, several of the authors remark on a phenomenon in non-native-language writing that Hoffman describes as the signifier becoming severed from the signified. By that, she means that words "don't stand for things in the same unquestioned way they did" (p. 106) in the native language. Hoffman discusses, for example, how words for emotional states in L2 can seem abstract, literary, or academic rather than evoking a visceral, emotional response as they do in L1. Likewise, Ngũgĩ observes that words in L2 may have an "alien far-away sound," making working through the medium of L2 "a cerebral activity and not an emotionally felt experience" (1981, p. 17). Both Hoffman and Ngũgĩ believe that this aspect of writing in a non-native language produces a voice with less authority, ease, and "harmony." This sentiment merits further attention. How does this sense of disembodiment from the target language affects one's ability or willingness to project a persona in L2 writing? We note with interest that the Latino authors discussed in this piece do not articulate this sense of separation from language as a problematic issue. Was it once an issue, but was resolved early in the experiences of bilingual writers such that they no longer recall it? Or perhaps in cases where L1 and L2 are learned simultaneously, such feelings of alienation from language are never evoked? Alternatively, one could speculate that in such contexts authors may feel an alienation or disconnectedness from both of their languages at times.

Another general observation about stylistic voice reported by these non-native language writers is that the way one is taught about writing in a certain language affects what one writes about and how one writes about it. Kaplan, for example, notes that she carries a value for stylistic voice in English that was conveyed to her by midwestern culture and particularly by her mother:

> "She is against waste in language. Her sentences are short and blunt, yet ripe with innuendo and the promise that more is being said than meets the ear. Now I write in the staccato Midwestern style she taught me" (p. 7).

Likewise, Chinua Achebe (1990) notes that Western critics often ask why African art, including writing, is so political. He asserts that in his native culture, writing is expected to carry a political and moral message as well as to be creative or to entertain. He notes that

in Igbo culture, the goddess of creativity is also the goddess of morality. He comments that in African writing,

> "People are expecting from literature serious comment on their lives. They are not expecting frivolity. They are expecting literature to say something important to help them with their struggle with life" (p. 88).

Thus, for Achebe, moral and political themes are integral to his sense of appropriate stylistic voice in writing, a cultural value that he maintains and transfers to a non-native language medium. Similarly, Anzaldúa notes that in her Native American cultural heritage, the purpose of writing is simultaneously religious, social, and aesthetic. Unlike Western writing, which she sees as being a rationally oriented exercise in virtuosity and mastery, writing in her native culture is supposed to evoke images, to have the same life-transforming and almost mystical properties as religious ritual. Anzaldúa likens her persona in writing to that of a shaman.

Finally, we noted at the beginning of this paper that studies of writing anxiety in L2 writers have sometimes shown that, in contrast to the assumption that L2 writing and self-expression is constricting and problematic, writers may actually feel less anxiety when writing in L2. We looked to these authors for indications that L2 writing might be liberating or less anxiety-producing than writing in L1, and explanations of why this might be so. Kaplan (1993) provides an illuminating discussion of this point. She asks,

> "Why have I chosen to live in not-quite-my-own-language, in exile from myself, for so many years--why have I gone through school with a gag on, do I like not really being able to express myself?" (p. 210)

Answering her own question, Kaplan observes that as she has taught French to others, she has come to see...

> "this French language as essential *in its imperfection*: the fact that we don't have as many words is forcing us to say more. The simplicity of our communication moves us, we're outside of cliché, free of easy eloquence, some deeper ideas and feelings make it through the mistakes and shine all the more through them. In French class I feel close, open, willing to risk a language that isn't the language of everyday life. A sacred language" (p. 210).

Similarly, the linguistic minority `border voices' argue that writing in a language that is neither L1 nor L2 can lead to greater creativity and can be artistically inspiring. Flores, for example, comments that

> "Whether the wildest extravagance of the bilingual poet or the most mundane comment of everyday life, Latino usage tends necessarily toward interlingual innovation. The interfacing of multiple codes serves to decanonize all of them, at least in their presumed discrete authority, thus allowing ample space for spontaneous experimentation and punning" (Flores & Yudice, 1990, p. 75).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

And Anzaldúa (1987) attributes her creativity as a writer to the fact that she lives in a state of "psychic unrest, in a Borderland" (p. 73).

IMPLICATIONS FOR NON-LITERARY L2 WRITERS

Although the above is a circumscribed treatment of literary writers' thoughts on voice and stylistic expression across linguistic boundaries, the reflections of the writers cited suffice to generate a heuristic for exploration of similar kinds of issues as they concern a wider stratum of non-native language writers. However, in the end we must ask how representative the issues articulated by this subset are of the concerns of most non-native language writers. Undeniably, there are caveats in looking to professional writers as a source of data. One is that they are a select group--they make their living as writers precisely because they are skillful with language, be it L1 or L2; moreover, they clearly enjoy the challenges posed by the creative process. (Those of us who teach L2 writing at the college or adult levels would wager that few students share the confidence in their writing ability implicit in Alice Kaplan's (1993, p. 194) assertion that "...writing isn't a straight line but a process where you have to get in trouble to get anywhere." We are left wondering how more average non-native-language writers performing more prosaic writing tasks might approach voice issues.

We would wish to pursue how some of the concerns expressed by these authors play out in other writing contexts; for example, when the purpose for writing is not artistic but functional, be it in academia or in the workplace. A dialogic perspective would suggest that L2 writers in these latter areas have a greater concern for *face* (Goffman, 1967), as they strive to present to their readers images of selves that appear 'smart,' 'competent,' and 'likable.' Such a perspective would also suggest that writers' concerns with issues of stylistic voice would diminish with a decrease in creative latitude or an increase in the number of normative discourse conventions associated with a given genre.

The sociocultural context of normative conventions, the L2 writers approximating them, and the readers of their texts must be carefully specified in this inquiry, however; for as Kachru (1987) has shown, discourse norms for English language writing differ considerably across contact varieties, and American monolingual norms cannot be regarded as the only target voice for L2 writers. Rather, normative tendencies for written expression, including voice, must be evaluated in terms of the varieties of English to which the L2 writer has access, the writer's expected audience, and the power relationship obtaining between writer and reader.

Another caveat in looking at professional, non-native-language writers is that they are self-selected in terms of language proficiency. As accomplished, published authors, they have moved beyond the basic communicative hurdles of making themselves understood in L2, and have resolved many of the mechanical and logistical problems that would impede self-expression in a non-native language. We would want to explore similar issues of voice and other affective factors with L2 writers at a range of proficiency levels. Such exploration would benefit from a research design that would include as a major component analysis of L2 writers' linguistic practices. Where language proficiency is a factor, readers' impressions

will be affected by perceptions regarding intelligibility of text, judgments formed from examining structural relationships at the surface level.

We are confident that further investigation of similar issues with a broader sample of writers will lead to both theoretical and pedagogical insights into the relation between affective factors and the L2 writing process. While first language writing research has provided us with suggestions regarding the nature of affective factors in second language writing, we nevertheless believe that at this point the introspections of non-native language writers themselves are needed in order to significantly enrich our understanding. Finally, as language educators, we see inquiry in the direction we are suggesting as integral to our pedagogical practice. Our students' experiential and interpretive frameworks are our most valuable allies as we continue to try to negotiate between institutional demands for conformity with the standard or dominant modes of self-expression in a culture, and our writers' needs to express their individual experience and persona as these have been constituted and reconstituted by the social and historical forces that have acted to shape their lives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our thanks to the National Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy for its support of the research reported here.

THE AUTHORS

Linda Harklau is Assistant Professor, University of Rochester. Her research focuses on the development of academic literacy in adolescent and adult learners. Her work has appeared in TESOL Quarterly, Linguistics and Education, and Anthropology and Education Quarterly. She was the 1995 recipient of the TESOL Distinguished Research Award.

Sandra R. Schecter is Assistant Professor, Education Faculty, York University. An ethno-linguist, she is Principal Investigator for a research project on "Family language environment and bilingual development" funded by the Spencer Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education. Her publications include articles in CMLR, AERJ, and the ESL text, Listening Tasks.

NOTES

[1]Kachru (1987) defines *contact literature* as "literatures written by the users of English as a second language to delineate contexts which generally do not form part of what may be labelled the traditions of English literature." Kachru points out that such literatures are likely to manifest culturally-specific collocational, lexical, and grammatical features.

REFERENCES

Achebe, C. (1975) *Morning yet on creation day*. London: Heinemann.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987) *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Bakhtin, M. (1986) *Speech genres and other late essays* (McGee, V. W., Trans.). (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, eds.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.) (pp. 259-422). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Eliot, T.S. (1954) *The three voices of poetry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Faigley, L. (1994) *Fragments of Rationality: Postmodernity and the subject of composition*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Flores, J. (1985) 'Que assimilated, brother, yo soy asimilao': The structuring of Puerto Rican identity in the U.S. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 13(3), 1-16.

Flores, J. & G. Yudice. (1990) Living borders/Buscando America: Languages of Latino self-formation. *Social Text*, 24, 57-84.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (D.F. Bouchard & S. Simon, Trans.). (D.F. Bouchard, ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Fox, B. & P.J. Hopper (eds.). (1994) *Voice: Form and function*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goffman, E. (1967) On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior* (pp. 5-45). Garden City, NY: Anchor Books; Doubleday & Company.

Hoffman, E. (1989) *Lost in translation: A life in a new language*. New York: Penguin.

Kaplan, A. (1993) *French lessons: A memoir*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kachru, B.B. (1987) The bilingual's creativity: Discoursal and stylistic strategies in contact literatures. In L.E. Smith (ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 125-140). New York: Prentice Hall.

Ngũgĩ, wa T. (1981) *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ngũgĩ, wa T. (1993) *Moving the centre: The struggle for cultural freedoms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Powers, J.H., & Gong, G. (1994) East Asian voice and the expression of cultural ethos. In K.B. Yancey (ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 202-225). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rowell, C.H. (1990) An interview with Chinua Achebe. *Callaloo: A Journal of African-American and African Arts and Letters*, 13(1), 86-101.

Safire, W. (1992, July 5) Counting the takes. *San Francisco Examiner*, This World, (p. 14).

Schecter, S.R. & L.A. Harklau. (1991) *Annotated bibliography of research on writing in a non-native language*. (Technical Report No. 51). Berkeley, CA: University of California, National Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy.

Schecter, S.R. & L.A. Harklau. (1992) Writing in a non-native language: What we know, what we need to know. (ERIC document reproduction service no. ED 353 825).

Silva, T. (1992) L1 vs L2 writing: ESL graduate students' perceptions. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL du Canada*, 10(1), 27-47.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Yancey, K.B. (ed.). (1994) *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.